

Housing Policies for the City of Toronto, 1966

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON HOUSING POLICIES FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO.

FINAL REPORT

Members of the Committee

Albert Rose (Chairman)
David B. Archer
John E. Broome
Charles E. Hendry
Norah Johnson (Mrs.)
Jacob Spelt
John C. Spencer
Donald F. Bellamy (Secretary)

January 5, 1966

CONTENTS

Letter of Transmissal

Final Report

Introduction

Explanations of Recommendations in Interim Report

Improving the Supply of Housing

Improving the Quality of Housing

The Case for a Housing Department in the City of Toronto

The Case for the Interim Appointment of a Housing Task Force

Recommendations of the Consultative Committee on Housing
Policies

Conclusion

List of Witnesses

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON HOUSING POLICIES

Room 426, 273 Bloor Street West, Toronto.

Chairman: Dr. Albert Rose Secretary: Professor Donald F. Bellamy

January 5, 1966

Mayor Philip G. Givens, Q.C.,
and Members of City Council.

Your Worship, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am pleased to submit herewith the Final Report of the Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto. This Report is the result of several months of intensive consideration of the appropriate housing policies which City Council might well adopt at this difficult time in the history of Toronto.

The Committee has met with many lay and professional persons experienced in the fields of housing, planning and urban renewal. In addition, the members of the Committee have devoted themselves to the most earnest and dedicated consideration of possible alternative policies. The City of Toronto, as the urban core of a vast region of nearly 2,000,000 persons, is in a most disadvantaged position at the present time. Unlike the situation in the United States, the City is severely limited in its power to negotiate directly with the federal and provincial governments to implement programmes in these fields.

In this Final Report the Consultative Committee explains fully and indeed reiterates the proposals contained in its Interim Report of October 15, 1965. Full consideration has also been given to the possibility of interim solutions to the severe problems in the field of housing, pending City Council's consideration of the major proposal to create a Department of Housing within the civic administration. In addition, we must await a decision by the Government of Ontario with respect to the future form of government in the Metropolitan Area of Toronto.

The Committee is fully aware that there are no quick and easy solutions to the many difficult problems which must be faced during the next several years. It is confident, however, that the analysis and recommendations contained in this Final Report can be of substantial assistance in arriving at appropriate policies.

Respectfully submitted,
Dr. Albert Rose, Chairman.

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON HOUSING POLICIES
FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

FINAL REPORT

The Consultative Committee for the City of Toronto, recommended to City Council in *Board of Control Report No. 30* and approved on August 12, 1965, is pleased to submit its Final Report.

In the three months since the Committee met for the first time on September 13, 1965 to determine its organization, procedures and schedule of operations, 24 meetings have been held involving more than 80 hours of deliberation. To these meetings have come 30 persons possessed of substantial knowledge and experience in the matter of public housing and urban renewal programmes. Some witnesses have been members of the appointed staffs of departments of either the City of Toronto or the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto; others have been provincial and federal officials. Some witnesses have been members of the Council of the City of Toronto and the Metropolitan Council. The Committee was greatly impressed with the competence and commitment of members of the professional staffs of the various departments of government, but it is not unaware that in any human organization there will be difficulties in relationships and consequent problems in collaboration. The list of witnesses is provided in an appendix to this Report and the Committee wishes to express its appreciation to all those persons who have been kind enough to provide assistance, information and advice.

I. Introduction

In the preliminary report submitted by the Chairman of the Consultative Committee to Board of Control on August 6, 1965, entitled "A Proposal for Establishment of a Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto", the terms of reference of the Committee were spelled out in some detail. The relevant passage of the report is the following:

... the fundamental question to place before the proposed Consultative Committee on Housing Policies is, "What can the elected and appointed officials in the City of Toronto do to improve the quantity and quality of housing accommodation available for families in the lowest two-fifths of the income distribution? What can be done in the immediate future, i.e. within the four months commencing September 1, 1965? What housing policies should be adopted for the medium term—the next year or two? What housing policies are likely to be most appropriate for the longer term—the next five years?"

The report indicated some of the major concerns which would have to be examined by the Committee in the course of its later deliberations:

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

the nature, causes and extent of slums in Toronto; the role of the City in public housing; supply of and demand for housing for welfare recipients; housing codes and their enforcement; relationships between the City departments of Buildings, Fire, Public Health, and Public Welfare, in the field of housing; relationships between the City of Toronto, the Ontario Housing Corporation and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the fields of public housing and urban renewal; social implications in urban renewal; the responsibility for relocation of families from public urban renewal and private redevelopment; and the merits and disadvantages of the potential appointment of a Housing Coordinator for the City of Toronto.

The Committee wishes to emphasize that its responsibility was to consider all of these and other related matters from the point of view of the determination of housing policies for the City of Toronto. A policy may be defined as "a particular course of action planned by a governing body in the administration of government".

It seems important in this Final Report to restate briefly the social, physical and political conditions which coincide in the first half of 1965 and led to the creation of the Consultative Committee. Although the population of the City of Toronto had been declining slowly since 1950 the nature of its needs for social services and social assistance were substantially changed by 1963, when population reached its lowest point in more than a quarter of a century. By 1965 the City of Toronto, still the hub and financial centre of a vast metropolitan area of some 1,750,000 persons, was composed, nevertheless, of a population whose average family income was far lower than that in the Metropolitan area as a whole; whose place of birth was far more likely to be outside Canada than that of the Metropolitan population as a whole; and whose length of residence in Canada, therefore, was likely to be of relatively short (probably of post-war) duration.

In particular, these residents lived in relatively old housing. In the Census of 1961 it was found that 94,391 dwellings within the City were constructed before 1920 and these comprised 81.4 per cent. of all dwellings in the Metropolitan area constructed prior to that date. At the same time only 10,747 dwellings within Metropolitan Toronto were in need of major repair and nearly 60 per cent. of these, 6,129 dwellings, were located within the City of Toronto. Overcrowding, defined as "a dwelling . . . in which the number of persons exceeds the number of rooms occupied", was indicated in 47,311 dwellings in the Metropolitan Area of Toronto; 45.9 per cent. of these were located within the City proper.

During the past 25 years Toronto has not been lax or without heart in its many efforts to meet the housing problems of its disadvantaged

residents. On its own account it has, since 1947, constructed Regent Park North, with 1,397 dwelling units with rents "geared-to-income" and more than 1,300 limited-dividend housing units with rents specified according to the nature and size of the accommodation and, to some extent, with respect to income. In the context of 1965 this is considered to be an inadequate public housing programme, yet it consists of approximately one-quarter of all the public housing dwelling units throughout Canada. Nevertheless, public housing accommodation with rents geared-to-income for families in the City of Toronto has been extremely scarce since the late 1950's and, with the completion of Regent Park South under the auspices of the federal-provincial partnership in 1960, very little additional accommodation of this kind has been made available. During the past decade the residents of the City of Toronto have had to look not only to the two senior levels of government for subsidized public housing but, in due course, were forced to seek assistance from the metropolitan level as well. The provision of public housing within the City has not been related to the needs of its residents but has been dictated by the uncertainties of provincial and federal housing policies, and the long delayed assumption of responsibility by the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

In the Spring of 1965 the consequences of 20 years of hesitant post-war housing activity, of changing provincial and federal legislation, of the shifting of the distribution of responsibility within the four levels of government, combined to bear bitter fruit. Also, the nature of housing production and the housing market in Metropolitan Toronto have changed drastically since 1957. The single-family house, particularly in the rapidly growing suburbs adjacent to the City, began to lose its dominant position in the housing industry in the late 1950's and, since 1958, apartment construction has come to dominate both the supply and demand sides of the housing market in Metropolitan Toronto. Eventually the construction of large apartment developments moved from the large spaces available in the sparsely populated suburbs to the already built-up sites within the City proper. Apartment construction on a vast scale within the City in recent years could mean only one thing—the destruction of substantial quantities of large older houses and their replacement by much larger numbers of dwelling units in the form of apartments suitable for single persons, young couples, and relatively small, self-sufficient families. Housing construction within the City has exceeded demolitions by more than five to one, but the vast quantity of new apartments is not capable of meeting the needs of the large numbers of modest-income recipients within the City. Furthermore, the relocation of families displaced by private redevelopment has only recently been recognized as a matter of public concern.

The growth of Metropolitan Toronto has had the paradoxical effect of compounding the housing difficulties of the core municipality. The City may receive great economic benefits from the growth of the metropolis, but the physical requirements of metropolitan growth are often met at the expense of the most disadvantaged residents of the central City. The vast requirements for roads, rapid transit facilities, public buildings, and other essential works result in the demolition of useful portions of the housing stock, while replacement for the kinds of families who are displaced is left to chance.

In the crisis that has been developing for the past 12 years and which has emerged so clearly in 1965, the only rational solution offered in Western industrial urban nations has been the provision of sufficient quantities of public housing at subsidized rentals.¹ This is the solution which Canada has sought to follow, albeit in staccato fashion, since the passage of the National Housing Act in 1944 and the creation of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in 1945. The rationale for public housing has always been, and continues to be today, the indisputable fact that a large proportion of families in the modern metropolis, perhaps as many as 20 per cent. of all families within the central City, are unable, with their own resources, to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing sufficient in quantity and adequate in quality to their needs. For the most part the two groups of families in the most difficult circumstances in the housing market are modest or low-income families with large numbers of children, and elderly couples who have retired on modest and usually fixed incomes. In all modern nations it is obvious that most of these families require the intervention of one or more levels of government to finance and construct housing accommodation which will be made available to them at rentals scaled according to their incomes, usually at or about 20 per cent. of their monthly income.

Since public housing is usually built by private builders operating under government contract, both the standards of accommodation and the costs have been quite high. Construction costs are very high because of the seasonal cycle of employment in the building industry and because of the expensive heating and other facilities required to meet Canadian climatic conditions. The enormous cost of central City land is an additional factor of great importance. As a consequence, the rental revenues available from public housing tenant families fall far short of the amounts required to meet all the costs of construction within the usual period of housing mortgages. The tax payers, usually at all levels of

¹ cf. Paul F. Wendt, *Housing Policy—The Search for Solutions. A Comparison of the United Kingdom, Sweden, West Germany, and the United States since World War II*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

government in appropriate shares, are thus called upon to make up the difference between the full financial requirements and the rental revenues; this difference is normally described as the rental subsidy. Subsidies are required because accommodation is *not* available for such families in the private housing market and because their incomes are too low to pay an economic rental even when the housing is provided under public auspices.

During its many hours of deliberation and consultation the Committee has operated under a set of assumptions which must be made very clear to those who may read, study and implement this Report. In the first place, the Consultative Committee has assumed that the role and responsibilities of the Governments of Canada and of Ontario in the housing field will gradually change but that these changes will be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. It is assumed that the National Housing Act will continue to be amended so as to broaden the opportunities for provincial and local governments in Canada to improve the quantity and quality of the housing within their boundaries. These opportunities will be provided through the extension of favourable financial arrangements by the Government of Canada to the governments of the provinces and through the provinces to the municipalities therein. As far as the Government of Ontario is concerned, the Committee has assumed that the Ontario Housing Corporation will exist for some years and will continue to construct and manage the bulk of public housing in this province. As far as Metropolitan Toronto is concerned, however, the Committee assumes that the responsibilities of the Metropolitan Corporation will increase and expand beyond any known during the first 12 years of metropolitan government in Toronto. The recommendations of the Metropolitan Urban Renewal Study as well as action pursuant to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto must be awaited.

The Consultative Committee has assumed that the great bulk of the financial resources available for the creation of public housing throughout Metropolitan Toronto will be made available by the Government of Canada. The Province of Ontario will continue to provide its share but will be prepared to expand its total financial commitment only as the programme of the Ontario Housing Corporation develops within the Province and throughout Metropolitan Toronto. The Committee is well aware that the financial resources of the City itself are limited and well circumscribed. Since 1954, when the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto was provided with the responsibility of borrowing for the capital requirements in all 13 municipalities, the City of Toronto has been relatively disadvantaged in its capital expansion programme, which has been limited to approximately \$13 million per annum. Never-

theless, its public debt has expanded significantly and it is extremely doubtful that the City could, entirely on its own resources, finance a public housing programme of the magnitude required for its residents. Thirteen years ago Toronto made its considerable credit standing available to the entire metropolis; today a portion of the strength and resources of the Metropolitan area should be mustered to restore its core.

Finally, the Committee assumes that there is good reason for optimism with respect to improvements in federal and provincial legislation, with respect to emerging techniques of urban renewal, and with respect to the methods of acquisition of public housing accommodation. In particular, it seems to the Committee that the present legislative and financial arrangements for urban renewal schemes are decidedly deficient with respect to those aspects of urban renewal known as "conservation of neighbourhoods" and "rehabilitation of housing". These two aspects of urban renewal programmes are of great importance to the City of Toronto, where there are still many neighbourhoods of good quality which must be protected from the encroachments of slum and blight if they are to remain serviceable portions of the housing stock. Moreover, there are vast quantities of older housing in the City, which could be rehabilitated if only appropriate techniques were developed to finance the physical requirements and thus maintain central city residents in their traditional occupancy.

Toronto's severe housing problems are under consideration at a time when the Metropolitan Official Plan is not yet officially approved, the new City Official Plan is in preparation, the Metropolitan Urban Renewal Study and its recommendations are about to be published, and a Comprehensive Redevelopment Programme is being prepared by the City Development Department. The climate is, therefore, one of uncertainty and this is a fact of great significance to a committee attempting to produce practical policies of housing for a city which is almost entirely built up.

II. *Explanations of Recommendations in Interim Report*

On October 15, 1965 the Consultative Committee presented to the Board of Control an Interim Report in which five recommendations were stated as the basis for a set of housing policies which the Committee felt that City Council ought to follow during the next several years. These recommendations were stated succinctly, yet it became clear during the discussion following the presentation of the Report, and in the ensuing City Council debate on October 27, 1965, that the recommendations needed amplification and additional explanation. This Report was presented to City Council in the form of *Report No. 38 of the Board of Control* on October 27, and the Board made a series of recommendations, all of which were adopted with one amendment. As a conse-

quence, a number of individual and joint reports from various City Commissioners are awaited.

The Consultative Committee wishes to emphasize that its further deliberations have provided no reason to withdraw any of its first five recommendations. It wishes to repeat these now and also to provide some further explanation of the meaning and intent of each.

The recommendations of the Consultative Committee in its Interim Report were the following (each re-statement is followed by an explanation):

Recommendation No. 1

The fundamental responsibility for the development and implementation of public housing and urban renewal programme should be assigned to the Metropolitan Corporation and the Metropolitan Council. A Metropolitan housing agency is one of the several forms suggested (previously) in the Interim Report is required.

The Committee is of the firm and strong view that the housing problems and requirements of the City cannot be viewed responsibly, nor can they be met adequately, apart from the housing problems and requirements of the entire Metropolitan area. The City has these problems largely because it is the core of a rapidly growing Metropolitan area. There is only *one* housing and urban renewal problem in Metropolitan Toronto; it is neither a City problem, nor a suburban problem, and it is certainly not 13 different and separate municipal problems. The Committee is aware of the fact that in February 1965 it was decided, by informal agreement between the City and Metropolitan Councils, that the Metropolitan Corporation alone would represent all 13 area municipalities in dealing with the Ontario Housing Corporation. The activities of the Corporation within the entire Metropolitan area are first reviewed with Metropolitan officials, whether or not these programmes are of direct concern to the needs of the City of Toronto.

Moreover, wherever inter-governmental arrangements for public housing are undertaken, the Metropolitan Corporation has, since 1956, assumed the responsibilities of the local municipalities in both the fields of housing and urban renewal. In the provision of public housing in Ontario the local municipality does *not* make a capital contribution but it is required to contribute 7½ per cent. of the rental subsidies needed. In Metropolitan Toronto the Metropolitan Corporation will make this contribution. In the field of urban renewal the local municipality in Ontario is required, under Section 23 of the National Housing Act, to contribute 25 per cent. of the net cost of land acquisition and clearance. In the Metropolitan Area of Toronto the Metropolitan Corporation will (as in Napier Place, for example) contribute the municipal share of the funds required to purchase and clear for public housing.

The first recommendation of the Consultative Committee, therefore, was intended to emphasize the emerging role of Metro in these matters and to urge the City Council to press for the assumption of responsibility by the Metropolitan Corporation. The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has never declared clearly and firmly that it is fundamentally responsible for the provision of public housing and urban renewal schemes throughout the Metropolitan Area of Toronto. It has literally backed into a series of financial responsibilities without explicit legislative authority. The City, on its part, has sought contributions from Metropolitan Toronto in respect of such proposals, partly as a result of its participation in the government of the Metropolitan Corporation and its financial contributions thereto, and partly as a consequence of its own tight financial situation. Since 1953 the housing problems of the City have been compounded by the reluctance of certain area municipalities to participate in large public housing programmes which might have relieved the serious situation within the central City. Only with a clear and formal assumption of basic responsibility can the Metropolitan Corporation avoid in future the long delays consequent upon the resistance of its constituent municipalities.

Recommendation No. 2

The City must retain its responsibilities for initiation and preliminary planning of such programmes within its own boundaries.

Notwithstanding the first recommendation, the Committee believes that the needs of individual families within their respective neighbourhoods are best known by the elected and appointed officials in each local municipality. Although the Metropolitan Corporation should assume fundamental financial responsibility, the City of Toronto must retain its existing responsibility for the expression of the needs of its citizens in various districts and planning areas within the municipality, and must advance its own view concerning the future growth, development and shape of the City over the next 10 or 20 years. It is not the view of the Committee that the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board should state where each urban renewal programme should be undertaken within the City of Toronto proper, or indicate what form the urban renewal scheme should take. It is the City of Toronto Planning Board that ought to plan in the first instance and make the needs and possible solutions clear to City Council, and then provide Council with enough information to decide which schemes and which set of priorities are more desirable than others. When City Council has made the decisions, then and only then should the Metropolitan Corporation enter the picture and its responsibility ought to be confined to legislative and financial implementation of proposals approved by City Council. This does not mean that Metropolitan Toronto planning officials cannot

express opinions as to major aspects of an urban renewal scheme, especially with respect to metropolitan-wide implications. It does emphasize the significance of local responsibility for local housing and planning requirements, and the vital importance of retaining these responsibilities.

Recommendation No. 3

City Council should establish a Department of Housing within the civic administration, to be headed by a Commissioner of substantial status. The respective responsibilities in the fields of housing and urban renewal of this new Department, the Development Department, the Metropolitan Corporation, and the Ontario Housing Corporation require careful study and, possibly, some redefinitions.

Throughout the entire post-war period City Council has emphasized its desire to improve the supply of subsidized public housing and has initiated and implemented some of the most important programmes in Canada. Nevertheless, housing policies within the City have never received the strong public support and emphasis which would, in the opinion of the Committee, be the major consequence of the initiation of a Department of Housing within the civic administration.² This declaration of policy by City Council would provide a strong moral support, a declaration of resolve that City Council was firmly determined to do everything within its power to meet the housing needs of its citizens. Moreover, the field of housing has never had the status which is consequent upon the establishment of a fully-fledged civic department whose responsibility is the performance of one major function. Most local functions are cared for in this fashion, and housing is the one significant responsibility that over the years has been distributed in bits and pieces throughout several departments of civic administration. *It is time to bring these sub-departments together under one roof and under one administration with sufficient status to make it entirely clear that the City of Toronto means business in this area of social responsibility.*

The Committee did not visualize that a Department of Housing would be an entirely new civic administration inserted between various existing departments, with an entirely new set of functions and a clear net addition to the City's operating budget. The fact is that many aspects of housing are already being provided within several existing departments. As a consequence of their dispersion and diffusion these sub-divisions lack authority, and their performance is less efficient and less significant than it would be if they were consolidated within a

² The term "civic administration" is intended by the Committee to mean the permanent staff establishment at any one time.

Department of Housing. Moreover, the City of Toronto is unique in that it is the only city in Canada which maintains its own Housing Authority and its own considerable stock of subsidized public housing at rents geared to income and of limited-dividend moderate rental housing. This stock of housing is a very substantial asset, the usefulness of which can hardly be comprehended as Canada embarks upon a set of programmes, sometimes referred to as a "War on Poverty", and in which many attempts will be made to raise the aspirations and improve the living standards of disadvantaged families. The Committee visualized the Housing Authority of Toronto as an integral part, perhaps the major operating division, of a Department of Housing. The present situation is one in which the various operations of civic departments and that of the Housing Authority are not fully known to each other and are clearly unco-ordinated. Within a Housing Department the City would be enabled to make a much more effective use of its staff and housing opportunities.

Recommendation No. 4

City Council must shun so-called "emergency housing" and, instead, acquire a stock of "housing for emergency purposes" through the purchase of older housing or the interim leasing of houses acquired by civic departments and agencies for later demolition. Areas designated for urban renewal ought to be exempt from this programme if we are to undertake the essential process of relocation of families on the site.

This recommendation was apparently very clear to members of Board of Control and City Council and had, in fact, already been implemented in part during the week that the Interim Report was presented. There is already evidence and appreciation of the importance of the housing acquired in the normal course of civic public works programmes. The traditional policy that such housing accommodation must be rented at the full market price has given way to the realization that every dwelling unit in the City can play some part in relieving the distress of the large numbers of families who are in urgent need of more adequate accommodation at rentals they can afford to pay. The additional cost to the tax payers of the City of Toronto is moderate.

Recommendation No. 5

The City and the Metropolitan Corporation should test their own use of the provisions of Section 16 and Sections 35C and 35D of the National Housing Act, even if this means foregoing provincial loans and subsidies which are apparently reserved for the Ontario Housing Corporation.

This last recommendation in the Interim Report of the Consultative Committee on Housing Policies was intended to bolster the resolve of

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

the elected and appointed officials of the City of Toronto to meet urgent housing requirements. It was not intended to deny that the major role in the provision of public housing throughout the Province of Ontario is to be undertaken by the Ontario Housing Corporation. Nevertheless, for nearly two decades the Housing Authority of Toronto has been engaged in the construction and management of subsidized public housing for families and limited-dividend accommodation at moderate rentals. In administering nearly 4,000 dwelling units the Housing Authority has gained much experience in all forms of public housing administration.

For some elected and appointed officials the creation of the Ontario Housing Corporation has apparently meant that the Housing Authority of Toronto could no longer construct limited-dividend let alone subsidized public housing within the City. In this recommendation the Committee emphasized that the legislative opportunities continue to exist and, if the City Council wishes to encourage a continuation of the efforts of its own Housing Authority, it is not barred from doing so. There is, however, an important financial cost involved in that the Government of Ontario has made it quite clear that its financial resources will be made available primarily to the Ontario Housing Corporation. This declaration of policy has no effect whatsoever in the continued use of Section 16 by the Limited-Dividend Housing Corporation of the City of Toronto, which is part and parcel of its own Housing Authority.

For the first time since 1950 the City could engage directly in the provision of subsidized public housing for families. It would be required to pay 10 per cent. of the capital requirements and one-half of the total subsidies, since the 42½ per cent. contribution by the Province would not be available. As a specific example, the City of Toronto could, if it wished, provide 200 units of subsidized public housing for families at a cost of approximately \$110,000 to \$120,000 in operating subsidies per annum. If it chose to offer its Housing Authority the same tax arrangements that pertain for Regent Park South, which is operated by the Ontario Housing Corporation, the subsidy would be substantially reduced. Since it is not absolutely certain that the Province would withhold the provincial share of rental subsidies, the Committee suggests that the City initiate a specific proposal and make the request for assistance.

This elaboration of the five major recommendations in the Interim Report of the Consultative Committee is intended for clarification and emphasis. These recommendations are neither contradictory nor inconsistent, but form a logical framework of policies which should govern the actions of City Council in conducting its affairs in the fields of

housing and urban renewal over the next few years. The following four sections of this Final Report are intended to serve both as the reasoned argument of the Committee in concluding its deliberations and as the documentation and amplification of its further recommendations.

III Improving the Supply of Housing

In order to understand the dilemmas which face the Council and appointed officials of the City of Toronto at this time in its history, a moderately detailed exposition of the roles and responsibilities of the four levels of government involved in the provision of public housing and urban renewal is required. The Government of Canada continues to amend the National Housing Act 1954 with a view to improving the basic federal legislation so as to assist the provinces and their local municipalities to carry out their functions in the realm of "property and civil rights". The major constitutional responsibility is obviously with the provincial governments.

The federal legislation is administered through a crown corporation created in 1945 and known as Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The Corporation administers a piece of federal legislation which considers not merely the housing requirements of low-income families but the opportunities for home ownership, for rental housing under private auspices, for slum clearance and urban redevelopment, for home improvement and home extension, and for the provision of public housing. The major role of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is the administration of substantial financial resources made available by the Government of Canada, the setting of standards, the stimulation of sound planning and attention to excellence in urban design and environment, and the stimulation of research in housing, community planning and related matters.

The governments of the provinces are required to pass legislation enabling the responsible agency of each province to enter into agreements with the federal agency. In Ontario the appropriate legislation was first enacted in 1949, as the Ontario Housing Development (Amendment) Act and it has since been altered, on many occasions, to bring it into line with the changes consequent upon a new National Housing Act in 1954 and the continued development of this Act through the major changes of June 1964. Since May 1964 the responsible agent of the Government of Ontario has been a Crown corporation known as the Ontario Housing Corporation. This Corporation began to operate in the Fall of 1964 and based its organization upon the existing administration of a federal-provincial housing authority known as the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, first created in December 1955, to administer and operate federal-provincial projects throughout Metropolitan Toronto. The Ontario Housing Corporation has the power to

own and sell land; to own, operate and dispose of existing housing accommodation; to construct, manage and operate public housing dwellings; to borrow money; to issue its own debentures; and, in a number of other ways, to develop a varied and full programme of housing throughout the Province of Ontario. Its major source of financial capacity to date has been the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which, under Section 35D of the National Housing Act, may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, make a loan to a province, municipality or public housing agency for the construction or acquisition of a public housing project. Such loans may not exceed 90% of the value of the project as determined by the Corporation.

Regent Park South is the only public housing project within the City of Toronto, apart from a few recently acquired scattered single dwelling units, that is operated and managed by the Ontario Housing Corporation. The operational acquisition of 732 dwelling units adjacent to Regent Park North would provide the City with a large degree of flexibility in meeting its public housing requirements. Some tenant families in existing projects managed by the Housing Authority of Toronto might wish to move voluntarily to suburban projects operated by the Ontario Housing Corporation. The City's own Housing Authority could then replace these tenants with those families and elderly couples in most urgent need. The Committee insists that there is a good case for a proposal that the operation of Regent Park South be transferred from the Ontario Housing Corporation to the Housing Authority of Toronto.

A vital aspect of the question of housing supply is the availability of land. Unfortunately, the City of Toronto is shaped like a semi-circle on the edge of the lake and in this half circle it has to accommodate all the functions and services normally found in the central area of a metropolis with close to two million inhabitants. The shortage of land in the central area is, therefore, a serious problem and, more than anywhere else, it is crucial that the land in this part of the City be used more efficiently.

Extensive areas are occupied by a mixture of manufacturing, wholesaling, service and residential regions. Industrial and commercial blight is widespread. Many industrial, commercial (wholesaling) and service establishments could quite conceivably be relocated and concentrated in modern multi-storey buildings. In such buildings, situated favourably with respect to major transportation interchanges, the firms would benefit from common heating, elevator, garage and parking facilities. This has been done successfully elsewhere and Toronto itself has examples of "flatted factories" in the garment district.

The land thus made available could be used for other purposes, including public housing. With the aid of modern technology there is no valid reason why industry and housing cannot be located in close proximity. Heavy traffic leading to and from industrial complexes might well be a greater contributor to the deterioration of housing than the industry itself. It is amazing to see the extent to which homeowners are prepared to maintain and renovate their homes close to industry as long as the street is free from heavy traffic.

The respective responsibilities of the Metropolitan Corporation and the City of Toronto have been discussed in the previous section of this Report. These responsibilities may best be exemplified by introducing a brief description of the steps which must be taken if the Napier Place Urban renewal scheme is to be implemented successfully.³ The Napier Place project is roughly bounded by Dundas Street on the North, Queen Street on the South, Broadview Avenue on the East, and the Don Valley Parkway on the West. The following pattern of progression will illustrate the inter-governmental arrangements that must be undertaken if the City of Toronto is to reap full benefit from the new legislation introduced at both the federal and provincial levels in mid-1964.

1. *Initiation*—identified by the City Planning Board as a renewal area in its Urban Renewal Study 1956 and in a report to the City Planning Board on Priorities for Urban Renewal Study Areas, 1963. It was more formally initiated by the City Planning Board in its Improvement Programme for Residential Areas, January 1965 (approved by City Council, March 1965) and Data Abstract (approved by the City Council, June 1965 and the Metropolitan Council—for participation in providing public housing—June 1965).

2. *Preliminary Planning*—by the City of Toronto Planning Board in reports to City Council in January, June, October and November 1965. Liaison in four-level planning was the responsibility of staff of the City Planning Board.

3. *Criticism and Review*—some revisions in the urban renewal scheme are possible through the future responsibilities of the Development Department of the City and the Ontario Housing Corporation. Under new (post-1964) provincial and federal legislation and policies, procedures in planning and implementation differ markedly from those at Alexandra Park. More detailed plans with greater finality are required; for example, those properties which are to be demolished and those which are to remain must be specified in advance. Such decisions

³ In the Committee's Interim Report these steps were documented for the Alexandra Park project.

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

are only now being made at Alexandra Park after many years of deliberation and planning.

4. *Implementation and Co-ordination*—by the Development Department of the City of Toronto, when agreements are executed and all approvals have been given.

5. *Land Acquisition and Clearance*—by the Real Estate Department, City of Toronto. Ownership of public housing sites will be held in perpetuity by the Ontario Housing Corporation. Of the total land to be acquired 60 per cent. is for public housing, and this cost is shared between the federal (50%), provincial (25%) and the metropolitan (25%) governments. The City finances the 25 per cent. municipal share for the land that is to be used for other than public housing.

6. *Land Titles*—by the Legal Department, City of Toronto.

7. *Relocation of Displaced Families and Households*—by the Development Department, City of Toronto.

8. *Design and Construction of Public Housing*—by the Ontario Housing Corporation, probably in 1966-67.

9. *Financing Capital Requirements for Public Housing*—

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation—90 per cent. loan to Ontario Housing Corporation

Ontario Housing Corporation—10 per cent. from the Province of Ontario.

10. *Financial Capital Requirements for Public Works, etc.*—in the case of public works costs will be shared between the federal (50%), provincial (25%) and the City (25%) governments. In the case of land for streets, parks and parking lots the City will be responsible for 100 per cent. of the costs.

11. *Operation and Management of Public Housing*—by the Ontario Housing Corporation.

12. *Financing Rental Subsidies in Public Housing*—

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation 50 %

Ontario Housing Corporation 42½ %

Municipality of Metro Toronto 7½ %

13. *Neighbourhood Improvement Programme*—by the appropriate departments of the City of Toronto, as co-ordinated by the Development Department.

In a built-up city like Toronto the possibility of increasing the supply of public housing rests largely within such urban renewal schemes as Napier Place and Alexandra Park. The description of the

steps taken in the case of Alexandra Park was provided in the Interim Report of this Committee and the steps that must be taken in the case of Napier Place make it quite clear that the task is tremendously complex. There is difficulty in determining the course of action to be taken in the first instance and appropriate action throughout the process for, no matter how good the legislation or how confident and competent the local officials, progress can only be made if both the horizontal and vertical relationships can be harmonized simultaneously.

Prior to the National Housing Act amendments of 1964 and the creation of the Ontario Housing Corporation, it was evident that approximately 5 years must elapse between the time of initiation and the eventual occupancy by tenant families of a major public housing or urban renewal scheme. With the creation of the Ontario Housing Corporation it was hoped that this process might be reduced to approximately 3 years. Although substantial progress has been made in the case of Napier Place there is impatience on the part of elected officials of the City because the complexity of inter-governmental arrangements has been neither clearly outlined nor understood. There is further difficulty involving the horizontal co-ordination of various departments of civic government, each with a portion of the responsibility for housing.

It should be clear to the residents of the City of Toronto that the establishment of the Ontario Housing Corporation has not produced any magic formula that will further reduce the study, planning, review and agreements which must be reached before an urban renewal scheme can be implemented and the construction of public housing begun. In fact, these matters are beyond the responsibility of the Ontario Housing Corporation—they lie with the realm of both the Community Planning Branch of the Provincial Department of Municipal Affairs and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. It should be noted that neither the construction of the first 47 houses in Alexandra Park has yet commenced nor has any other construction of new public housing proceeded beyond the stage of conception and planning. The Ontario Housing Corporation has tried to expand the supply of public housing within the City by offering to purchase existing housing of reasonably good quality at fair market prices, but most of the housing offered for purchase has been unsuitable on these criteria. As a result the total holdings of the Corporation at the time of writing are less than 50 houses. It is quite probable, in the view of the Committee, that the City of Toronto could create new public housing on its own initiative as quickly as the Corporation can now proceed in the case of the urban renewal programmes.

Many schemes have been proposed for improving the supply of public housing within the boundaries of the City but, on analysis, most

of these will be found merely to involve the substitution of one group of families by another. The purchase of existing housing by the Ontario Housing Corporation is a case in point. What happens to the families (and to their tenants, if any) who have sold their dwellings to the Ontario Housing Corporation? They move out and increase the demand for housing within the Metropolitan area while they are replaced in their former housing by families who have applied for public housing. It is difficult to regard this process as a significant addition to the supply of housing for low-income families.

In the same manner proposals for the supplementation of rents paid by low-income families cannot be viewed as an improvement in the supply of housing. It is undeniable that rent supplements would prevent many families from being forced to move, or protect them from eviction at the hands of landlords who see the prospect of increased revenues from different tenants. These problems may be regarded as urgent and they are clearly matters of consequence to the public welfare; but the maintenance of such families in existing accommodation, which may be seriously sub-standard in any event, is hardly an improvement in the quantity of public housing.

In the United States' Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 provision was made in Title I, entitled "Special Provisions for Disadvantaged Persons", for a rent supplementation programme. After presentation of its Interim Report the Consultative Committee was specifically asked to examine the applicability of these proposals in the context of the housing problems in Toronto. The Committee has learned that in 1965 the United States Congress did not vote funds to initiate this programme and it has not yet begun. In a recent announcement it was implied that the scheme will commence in 1966 and will authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make annual payments to a "housing owner" on behalf of "qualified tenants". The term "housing owner" means a private non-profit corporation, a limited-dividend corporation, or a co-operative housing corporation, which has been approved both for mortgage insurance and for receiving the benefits of this new programme. The term "qualified tenant" means lower income families "who are elderly, handicapped, displaced by governmental action, victims of a natural disaster, or occupants of substandard housing." The proposal resembles, in part, the programme which has existed for many years in Section 16 of the Canadian National Housing Act 1954. It goes further, however, in that it is designed to provide the difference between partially subsidized rentals and the tenant families' capacity to pay approximately 25 per cent. of their income for rental.

A second American proposal entitled "Low Rental Housing in Private Accommodations" (Sec. 23) is similar to the recent suggestion

of the Housing Authority of Toronto that the City embark on a rent supplementation programme and to the former Rent Certificate Plan of the Province of Ontario. The new Section 23 authorizes public housing agencies to enter into contracts with the owners of dwellings to provide low-rental housing in private accommodations. The rental will be negotiated by the agency and the owner, and the tenant will pay a rental in accordance with the standards in normal low rent housing projects. The housing agency will pay any necessary supplement (rental subsidy) to the owner. All of these plans are intended to maintain tenant families in existing housing accommodation. Such rent supplement or certificate programmes may help to relieve the pressure on existing public housing and may reduce the expenses of the community in resettling families who are likely to be evicted from older housing as rentals increase. There is also the possibility that the prospect of rentals guaranteed by the City would induce some landlords to improve the quality of their premises. Nevertheless, it is doubtful that programmes of rent supplementation will have a significant effect in increasing the supply of public housing.

IV Improving the Quality of Housing

The City of Toronto earned an historic reputation as a pioneer in the field of housing standards enforcement through the enactment in 1936 of one of the first pieces of local housing legislation in North America. By-law 14466 was a direct consequence of the revelations of the Lieutenant Governor's Committee to Investigate Housing Conditions in the City of Toronto (the Bruce Commission) which reported late in 1934. The Legislature of Ontario passed the necessary private bill and Toronto began a programme to enforce standards with respect to maintenance of housing and with respect to occupancy. Although the history of code enforcement thus extends over 30 years, it is paradoxical that the City of Toronto does not enjoy a reputation for vigorous enforcement of its own legislation, possibly because of the difficulty of regaining momentum after the war years.

Some eight years ago the Association of Women Electors and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto (through their Housing Committees) embarked on a joint venture, together with other interested civic organizations, to revise and improve the City's housing standards legislation and its enforcement. In the first year or two emphasis was placed on the enforcement of the existing by-law which, with slight change, was essentially the original code of 1936. Problems included the fact that the courts were overly busy with other litigation which seemed more important. Charges laid under By-law 14466 in the magistrates' courts were very often dismissed or were settled when the magistrate registered a conviction and imposed a modest fine, perhaps \$10-\$25 on the offending landlord or home owner. It was little wonder

that the small group of housing inspectors were discouraged and frustrated. City Council did respond to the pleas of the civic organizations in several ways: by extending its programme of progressive inspections, by encouraging the appointment of a Crown Prosecutor who would specialize in code enforcement cases and some administrative changes were made to improve enforcement. In addition, a request was made for the assignment of one or more magistrates who would become more knowledgeable in housing matters. But no special, fully-fledged court of the successful City of Baltimore type was instituted however.

By 1964 the major citizens' organizations mentioned previously had reached the conclusion that substantial revisions in the housing code were required and that a further expansion of the housing inspection staff was absolutely essential. A Provincial publication *A Better Place to Live* had been published in 1962, as a result of a federal-provincial study, holding out the promise of province-wide permissive legislation for local "maintenance and occupancy" standards. In addition, studies leading to "A Plan for the Don" indicated without question the need for higher standards and more adequate enforcement. The resolve of interested citizens to obtain full use of housing standards as a conservation measure in urban renewal was strengthened. By the summer of 1965, their efforts, in the form of a widely supported brief, bore fruit, and the City passed a new Standards of Housing By-law, without repealing the original legislation of 1936. The Committee of Civic Officials charged with drafting the new by-law reasoned that a combination of new and old powers was required. The provisions inserted in 1964 in the Ontario Planning Act (Sec. 30a) for "maintenance and occupancy" standards proved to be unsatisfactory in several ways for Toronto's use. This is the situation at the present time and, as this Final Report is presented to City Council, the first cases under the new by-law will be heard in the appropriate court. Many important changes have been made in the details of standards required and in the severity of the penalties which may be levied for persistent infractions. The maximum fine has been increased from \$50 to \$300.

Code enforcement has crucial significance in improving the quality of housing and in urban renewal programmes. Its value is not confined to the central city alone. It is likely to be most successful if it is regarded, not as a policing function, placing one more burden on hard-pressed home owners, but as a measure in which the City assists owner-occupants in home improvements while standing ready to be severe with neglectful landlords.

The positive aspects of the maintenance of the standards of housing and occupancy within the relatively old housing stock of the City of Toronto have scarcely been emphasized and, in the view of the

Committee, merit continuous elucidation and emphasis. The fact is that an older city in the centre of a metropolis must do everything it can to preserve the quality of its older housing stock. It is not merely that each dwelling unit capable of being saved through a programme of regular and continuous maintenance is crucial, but it is also true that, in general, most older housing is capable of providing accommodation for the larger and most disadvantaged families who populate the central city in far greater proportion than other municipalities in the metropolis. Since continuous demolition of certain portions of the housing stock is a high price that must be paid for urban growth and development, the balance of the sound dwellings within the City must be carefully preserved. The techniques available are in the process of development and, at the present time, the enforcement of local housing codes remains one of the principal techniques. The methods that Toronto has employed to date have been shown to be ineffective and inadequate to serve these purposes. The Committee is most encouraged by City Council's recent action in enlarging the housing inspection staff and appointing a senior official to direct the inspectors' work. The Consultative Committee believes this reflects a growing conviction as to the worth of a preventive programme.

The urban renewal programmes, still new and experimental throughout Canada, will soon offer additional opportunities with respect to those aspects of the programme which are known as "conservation of neighbourhoods" and "rehabilitation of housing". The essence of these phrases lies, firstly, in the realization that neighbourhoods which are still sound and not yet afflicted by blight must be "conserved" through deliberate programmes of neighbourhood improvement and through the enforcement of local housing legislation. Such programmes, however, will require far more than inspections as a response to complaints, and far more than casual and haphazard inspections at long intervals of time. There must be deliberate and intensive programmes of housing inspection and code enforcement if older neighbourhoods within the City are to be protected from the onset of blight rather than face the dire consequences which are inevitable when slum conditions become deeply rooted.

Secondly, there is the little understood programme known as "housing rehabilitation" which has scarcely been attempted as yet within Canadian cities. At the present time such programmes are part of urban renewal schemes in Alexandra Park in Toronto and in the North End urban renewal project in Hamilton, Ontario. As far as Alexandra Park is concerned a deliberate programme of housing rehabilitation is perhaps a year or two in the future. In the meantime a study undertaken under the auspices of the City of Toronto Planning Board will be completed early in the New Year and should provide

significant information with respect to the prospects for rehabilitation in central Toronto. But the tools and techniques available at present will be inadequate to induce individual homeowners (most often of modest family income) to invest financial resources, materials, and personal labour in the rehabilitation of their homes unless a good deal of attention to neighbourhood improvement is given by the appropriate departments of the City of Toronto. The difficulties of low-income families, elderly couples and elderly single persons deserve special attention in this connection. It will be of little profit to the City if the processes of code enforcement and urban renewal result in the expulsion of many families from existing dwellings by virtue of financial inadequacy. Relocation services, including full use of the Metropolitan Housing Registry, are essential in easing the problems of persons who may be adversely affected by measures to reduce overcrowding or improve housing quality.

In the view of the Consultative Committee, the importance of instituting all positive methods of improving the quality of housing within the City can scarcely be underestimated. This process will require techniques of community organization and self-improvement which have not before been undertaken, either in this community or in this country. At the same time new approaches must be employed to press recalcitrant landlords and tenant families to maintain their housing accommodation at the desirable standards laid down in local housing legislation. The Committee has explored special experimental programmes which have recently been undertaken in such cities as Chicago, New York, and in other communities. All over the United States new approaches are in the process of development and trial. The Assembly of the State of New York passed an Act on May 26, 1965, the preamble to which reads:

AN ACT

To amend the real property actions and proceedings law and the New York city civil court act, in relation to special proceedings by tenants of multiple dwellings in the City of New York for a judgment directing the deposit of rents with the clerk of the civil court and the use thereof for the purpose of remedying conditions dangerous to life, health or safety and authorizing the appointment of an administrator to administer such moneys subject to the court's direction.

In the City of Chicago grossly neglected multiple dwellings whose owners have been charged again and again with housing code infractions may be placed in "receivership" and turned over to local community groups who are permitted to use the rental revenues to rehabilitate the structures. Admittedly, these new departures are limited

thus far to multiple dwellings, but the strength of the demands for new approaches to the control of the exploiting landlord is quite evident.

In the Province of Ontario action is required to strengthen local opportunities for the conservation and rehabilitation of older housing in cities like Toronto. The Committee urges City Council to discuss these important questions with officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs and, if necessary, to strive for special legislation to permit the city to place additional pressure upon landlords, and homeowners, who consistently violate the by-laws governing standards of housing maintenance and of occupancy of dwellings. It is a curious fact that some persons make a good deal of profit from the exploitation of slum properties and yet, on the other hand, assessment procedures may punish those who improve their properties. The Committee did not feel that the matter of assessment was within its terms of reference but it hopes that the Ontario Committee on Taxation will bring forth some useful recommendations on the subject. In addition, where properties are held for speculative purposes, awaiting re-zoning, City Council should seriously consider taking steps to prevent deterioration, to prohibit demolition of sound houses until the re-zoning is approved, and to provide relocation services to the residents.

V The Case for a Housing Department in the City of Toronto

The case for a Housing Department within the administration of the City of Toronto rests squarely upon the special housing needs which exist within this City. The Committee's discussion has identified the special problems of unattached persons, homeless transients, the disabled, independent elderly families, foster families, newcomer families from outside and inside Canada and, cutting across all of these categories, the broad classification of low-income families. The special situation of the City of Toronto, a housing crisis that has been described as the worst since the end of World War II, is not merely that of any central city in a modern metropolis but is unique, in Canada. It is not just a difference in degree, when one compares the situation in Toronto with that of Vancouver, Winnipeg, or Montreal, but there is a substantial difference in kind, which justifies the adoption of extraordinary measures of public administration.

Residential land use is the most important single form of land use in the City, yet no single body within the civic government is specifically and exclusively concerned with it. Matters concerning housing will always remain close to the hearts of the people and a main reason for their interest in local government. At the present time the need for housing accommodation is more evident than ever before. One single voice is required to exert concerted and continuous pressure

on the four levels of government concerned with the planning and implementation of public housing and urban renewal programmes and to exercise a "watch dog" function. The public requires a centre where its interests with respect to housing problems are the sole *raison d'être*. This raises the question of whether a department of civic government *can* exert the desired pressure. In the view of the Consultative Committee this would depend on the organization and the status of a Department of Housing, and upon the competence and stature of its Commissioner.

The serious difficulties in co-ordination among the various sub-departments within the civic administration concerned with matters of housing and urban renewal must be overcome. A single Department of Housing can be assigned the responsibility of co-ordination and if the various sub-departments are transferred to the new department (as this Report will suggest) co-ordination can be assured. Moreover, one Department of Housing for the City of Toronto could deal effectively with the other three levels of government. The matter of code enforcement was discussed previously in this Report. The federal agency, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, will surely amend the National Housing Act to provide for more effective measures in this area of urban renewal when it is satisfied that civic administrations are able to make use of more effective federal aids. A housing department is a major step towards ensuring that federal and provincial officials will be aware of the determination of the civic administration and the existence of the tools to complete the tasks.

A Department of Housing for the City of Toronto would, in the view of the Committee, be charged with a variety of functions, all of which might be described as housing responsibilities. In general this department would be concerned with public housing, the housing component in urban renewal schemes, relocation of families, rehabilitation, neighbourhood conservation and stabilization, housing inspection, the enforcement of by-laws concerned with standards of both maintenance and occupancy, housing for emergency purposes, and the management and operation of the housing stock created by the City through the Housing Authority of Toronto. The tasks envisaged by the Committee will be considered in some detail, and the changes required in the present civic administration will be outlined.

1. *Public Housing*

Public housing programmes would be initiated by a Department of Housing in consultation with the City of Toronto Planning Board. The demands upon the department for housing accommodation, and its own awareness of the needs of the community, would lead departmental officials to request that the staff of the Planning

Board undertake the necessary research and preliminary planning and place the housing schemes in their wider planning context. These schemes would come forward, possibly in the form of simple proposals for the building of public housing under the auspices of the former Housing Authority of Toronto, possibly as requests to the Metropolitan Corporation to be submitted to the Ontario Housing Corporation, or possibly in the form of a housing component within an urban renewal scheme. Whatever the nature of the proposal, it would be the task of the Department of Housing to assume the co-ordinating functions within civic administration and to ensure that the public housing be constructed as expeditiously as possible within the existing legislative and financial arrangements of the senior levels of government. The City of Toronto Department of Housing might also encourage the promotion of housing schemes by such interested voluntary bodies as churches, charitable organizations, and co-operative societies. These groups sorely need an advisory service to provide them with the essential information, a service that is not provided, as yet, within any level of government.

The operation and management of the City's own public housing stock would continue to be entrusted to the Housing Authority of Toronto, which would become a division within the Department of Housing. Another division would be entrusted with the problem of relocating individuals and families as a consequence of private and public urban renewal programmes. The present emerging relocation advisory service within the Development Department should be lodged within the new Department of Housing. Housing for emergency purposes would be the responsibility of a further division, to be developed through the transfer of the Housing Unit from the Department of Public Welfare.

2. *Conservation and Stabilization of Neighbourhoods, and Rehabilitation of Housing*

Another major responsibility of a Department of Housing would be concerned with those aspects of urban renewal described as conservation of neighbourhoods and rehabilitation of housing, and this would involve the Department in the administration of code enforcement throughout the existing housing stock. One requirement would be the development of an advisory service to homeowners and tenants concerning all aspects of home improvement. The skilled tradesmen now employed as housing inspectors within the Buildings Department of the City have the kind of knowledge which is essential for this purpose. In the view of the Consultative Committee it is imperative that the housing inspection staff now

within the civic administration be transferred to a new Department of Housing.

This division of the Department would work closely with the City of Toronto Planning Board in the development and presentation of its surveys and plans. The support of a Department of Housing would facilitate the process of planning within the City, and would aid the work of the Development Department, both in its negotiations with private developers and in its responsibilities for the implementation of urban renewal schemes. One of the most serious weaknesses in implementation has been that portion of the urban renewal programme which may be loosely described as a "neighbourhood improvement programme". The Committee has been advised that this is the responsibility of various City Departments as co-ordinated by the Development Department. It seems clear, however, that there is no definite determination within the present civic administration to get on with the task of instituting an overall conservation programme. A good deal of the distress, deterioration and apathy within Alexandra Park is a consequence of the failure of the City to demonstrate its determination to improve the neighbourhood and to give the residents some good reason for investing their own efforts and resources in the maintenance and rehabilitation of their own properties. A department whose sole concern is housing would not merely co-ordinate this process but would urge the exercise of the City's responsibilities by ensuring that the appropriate departments were in the appropriate place with the appropriate programme at the appropriate time.

3. *The Code Enforcement Programme*

In these arguments the Committee does not imply that the housing inspection staff of the present Department of Buildings is lacking in willingness and determination to enforce local housing by-laws. Nevertheless, the City possesses a variety of inspectors in various departments—Fire Inspectors, Health Inspectors, Building Inspectors, Housing Inspectors—and it seems unfortunate that, although the scales of payment are practically identical, Housing Inspectors appear to have the lowest status. The Fire Inspector wears a uniform but has no right of entry to a home; he is considered by the public to be a benefactor and his suggestions, if any, merely require voluntary compliance. The Health Inspector has the right of entry to residential and other premises yet, in the view of the public, his function is the prevention of disease and the spread of epidemics, and although his requirements must be complied with they appear to have gained public support rather than resentment. It is unfortunate but apparently true that the Housing Inspector, who also has the right of entry to residential premises, is considered

by many persons to exercise a negative function and to be a source of burden rather than assistance.

The Consultative Committee believes that one answer to this serious problem is a programme of education and advice to homeowners and tenants, available without cost throughout the community. The Housing Inspector must gain the respect which is now accorded to the Fire Inspector; to accomplish this would require careful selection of personnel, intensive training and, perhaps, a different job title. Within a Department of Housing this staff would have access to the information and resources of a department solely concerned with matters of housing. The required educational programme would be the responsibility of an Information Division of the Department of Housing.

The Committee is convinced that federal and provincial legislation will be amended in due course to make resources available, or to give authority to local governments, to make loans and grants to homeowners in order to help them maintain the physical standards of their accommodation at a satisfactory level. While it is true that home improvement loans are at present available through the banks, the rate of interest is a deterrent, particularly to many modest-income families in central Toronto. There can be no doubt that government will have to provide a form of assistance to ensure that the maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock is carried out. Any philosophical objection to financial assistance can be overcome by placing a lien upon the property, to be recovered when that property is sold. The chief aim of code enforcement in the City of Toronto should be to provide safeguards for the responsible homeowner and not to impose controls in a critical or punitive manner upon owner-occupants.

In concluding its case for the creation of a Department of Housing within the civic administration of Toronto, the Committee emphasizes that while Toronto does not have a Department of Housing as such, it has, in fact, several sub-departments of housing, identifiable within already existing departments of the City of Toronto. So it can be argued that much work of the civic administration is directly or indirectly related to the housing of its citizens. At the present time housing responsibilities are spread out in such departments as:

Buildings

responsible for housing inspection and the process of code enforcement.

Development

responsible for the implementation of urban renewal schemes, which often involve programmes of public housing. This Department is in the process of creating a relocation advisory service.

Property

responsible for the maintenance and disposal of city-owned properties including housing acquired in the implementation of public works.

Public Health

responsible for enforcement of the sanitation by-laws and which has strong powers to condemn, in order to demolish, unfit dwellings.

Public Welfare

responsible for meeting the emergency needs of individuals and families, including the short-term provision of shelter, and which refers cases of poor housing maintenance where families in receipt of public assistance are residing to the Inspectors in the Buildings Department.

Real Estate

which has the responsibility for acquiring existing housing and other buildings required for public purposes, such as urban renewal schemes.

In addition to these departments the City of Toronto Planning Board has several responsibilities in the field of housing, including the initiation and preliminary planning of programmes directed towards the elimination of pockets of blight and slum.

The Consultative Committee suggests that the function of housing inspection and code enforcement be transferred from the Department of Buildings to the new Department of Housing; that responsibility for the relocation of displaced families and individuals from public urban renewal programmes and private redevelopment schemes be transferred from the Development Department to the new Department of Housing; that the Housing Unit within the Department of Public Welfare be transferred to the new Department of Housing. In addition, it has already recommended that the Housing Authority of Toronto be dissolved in its present form and reconstituted as the major operating division of a new Department of Housing. The functions and responsibilities in the field of housing of such Departments as Property, Public Health, and Real Estate would remain unchanged.

VI *The Case for the Interim Appointment of a Housing Task Force*

The Consultative Committee is well aware that its recommendation for the creation of a Department of Housing within the civic administra-

tion of Toronto will take some time to implement. The proposal must first be debated and, assuming that the overall concept is approved, the specific allocation of duties and responsibilities to a Department of Housing and to its Commissioner will then require the most careful consideration. In particular, the Committee recognizes that there may be substantial differences of opinion and judgment concerning its suggestion for a relocation of various sections of existing departments to a new Department of Housing. Moreover, the process involved in the appointment of a Commissioner of Housing with the appropriate qualifications and experience will require several months to complete.

In the meantime, the City of Toronto will continue to face a severe shortage of decent, safe and sanitary housing accommodation for the lowest third, perhaps even for the lowest half, in the income distribution of its residents. The present crisis is clearly a consequence of growth and prosperity, plus the inevitable fact that the social and economic opportunities in the development of an affluent society are not equally distributed among the entire population. The shortage will not lessen nor will the crisis disappear if Canada should, unfortunately, experience a serious economic recession akin to that of the years 1959-62, when unemployment reached a proportion as high as 10 per cent. or 11 per cent. of the total labour force. In fact, many of the persons who have moved to the City and the Metropolitan Area of Toronto from other parts of Canada and from other countries during the past decade, and who are now reasonably well housed, may indeed become applicants for public housing accommodation if unemployment were to become widespread. Even in the event of continued prosperity and a substantial increase in the available stock of public housing accommodation, there is some doubt that the list of applicants would be greatly reduced from the present levels. It is equally true in the housing field, as in many other aspects of endeavour, that "nothing succeeds like success". The Committee reiterates the view expressed in its Interim Report that the magnitude of the present list of applicants for housing accommodation at the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Registry is partly a consequence of real and even dire need, and partly a consequence of the publicity given to the activities of the Ontario Housing Corporation in its purchase of large groups of existing housing in the suburban areas of Metropolitan Toronto. The members of City Council will have to live with the prospect of a large waiting list of public housing applicants for many years to come.

There is another factor which leads the Consultative Committee to its consideration of special measures at this time, and that is the uncertain future of the present City of Toronto within the emerging structure of Metropolitan Government in this area. The *Report of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto* proposed that the City of

Toronto, be one of four cities or boroughs within the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. If this proposal were adopted the City boundaries would in fact be enlarged to include the Township of York, the Township of East York, the Town of Leaside, and the villages of Forest Hill and Swansea. The population of the proposed City of Toronto would be approximately 900,000 persons within Metropolitan Toronto. Should this proposal be adopted the housing problems within the new City of Toronto would take on added dimensions, and there is no doubt that the Government of Ontario, in co-operation with the Government of Canada, would have to provide new legislative and financial provisions to meet the needs of an enlarged city.

For these two major reasons (a) the dimensions of the existing shortage of public housing accommodation and the prospect of its continuance for many years to come, and (b) the uncertainty with respect to the future structure of Metropolitan Government in the Toronto area, the Consultative Committee recommends therefore that immediate and urgent consideration be given by City Council to the appointment of a Housing Expediter as the Chairman of a Housing Task Force for the City of Toronto. The Committee suggests that this administrative structure should include, in addition to the Chairman, the Director of Residential Building Inspection recently appointed in the Department of Buildings, and the Executive Director of the Housing Authority of Toronto. These three persons would constitute a Housing Task Force charged with the responsibility and provided with the authority to expedite a considerable improvement in the supply of public housing accommodation and in the quality of the existing housing stock in the City of Toronto during the next five years. The Committee believes that a Housing Task Force should be viewed as an interim solution and administrative arrangement pending the determination of the political structure of the City of Toronto and pending the discussion of the Committee's proposal for the establishment of a Department of Housing within the civic administration.

The Chairman of the Housing Task Force would be designated as an Executive Assistant to the Mayor of Toronto, with sole responsibility to co-ordinate and expedite all aspects of the housing problem which are of concern to the civic administration. This person, who can be lodged for administrative purposes within the Department of the City Clerk, should be directly responsible to the Mayor, or to the Mayor through one of the members of Board of Control. There is a strong case for placing special responsibility for housing policies in the hands of a member of Board of Control. In conjunction with the Director of Residential Building Inspection and the Executive Director of the Housing Authority, the Chairman will be concerned, as well, with code

enforcement and with the operation and management of the City's substantial stock of public housing accommodation.

The Chairman of the Housing Task Force would have to be a person with superior qualifications and experience akin to those required for the proposed Commissioner of Housing. Such a person may not now be employed within the civic administration and he should be engaged only after diligent search within Canada, North America, and abroad, if necessary. The Committee believes that this person should preferably be one who has devoted most of his professional career to the field of housing, whether under public or private auspices. The appointee should be a person whose record and performance, with respect to the objectives of public housing and urban renewal programmes, indicates concern with the public's social responsibility to meet human need, rather than that of providing housing accommodation in buildings to be operated and managed.

If the Committee's recommendation for the creation of a Department of Housing is approved, it will be the further responsibility of the Housing Task Force to develop the means whereby this Department is brought into existence with the least possible dislocation and disruption of existing departments and existing administrative arrangements. It is not absolutely essential that the Chairman of the Housing Task Force become the new Commissioner of Housing, if such a department is created, but the Committee does not rule out this possibility. The Chairman, whose term must be at least 3 to 5 years if we are to attract the right person to the task, will be the one voice for housing in the City of Toronto which City Council has been seeking and which the public has been demanding for many years. It is assumed that the Chairman will become a member of the Co-ordinating Committees which now exist, or will be created, for each urban renewal project.

VII Recommendations of the Consultative Committee on Housing Policies

In conclusion the Consultative Committee holds strongly to the principle that, wherever possible, the City of Toronto should take care of its own housing requirements by playing a substantial role in inter-governmental arrangements in which construction and management are provided under the auspices of other levels of government. As a basic principle the City should attempt to retain the ownership of as much as possible of the land devoted to public projects within its boundaries.

The Committee feels, therefore, that it has a great responsibility to emphasize the significance of housing and planning policies and present decisions for the future of the central City. The senior levels of government should not own large amounts of land within the boundaries of the municipality. Five, ten, or twenty years from now there may be serious

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

conflict between the City and the Province with respect to the taxation of crown-owned land, with respect to the possibilities of expropriation for future redevelopment, with respect to zoning policies, and with respect to land use control. For a city and a metropolis the size of Toronto there is already a tremendous shortage of land in central areas. In the view of the Committee the important part of the solution to this problem lies in judicious land use planning within large urban renewal areas.

In making its final recommendations the Committee has incorporated the proposals in the Interim Report together with the conclusions reached in its more recent deliberations. The housing policies which the Consultative Committee recommends for adoption by the Council of the City of Toronto are the following:

Recommendation No. 1

City Council should strive, within its own jurisdiction and as a major component of the Metropolitan Council, for the assumption of fundamental responsibility for legislative and financial implementation of housing and urban renewal programmes by the Metropolitan Corporation. To some extent this process is already under way but what is required is an absolutely clear set of legislative and financial arrangements between these two levels of municipal government in their negotiations with the Government of Ontario and the Government of Canada.

Recommendation No. 2

The City must retain its responsibilities for initiation and preliminary planning of such programmes within its own boundaries. The Committee is strongly of the view that unless the City exercises its power to determine (a) the location, type and density of new housing, (b) the way in which it will carry out its housing standards programme, and (c) neighbourhood improvement programmes involving minor local public works, it would cease to merit existence as a viable municipality.

Recommendation No. 3

City Council should establish a Department of Housing within the civic administration, to be headed by a Commissioner of substantial status. The new Department would take over several major housing sections currently located within other departments: the Housing Authority of Toronto would become its division of operations and management; the housing inspection staff of the Department of Buildings would become its division of housing conservation and rehabilitation; the emerging relocation service in the Development Department would become its division of relocation; and the Housing Unit within the Department of Public Welfare would become its division of housing for emergency purposes.

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.*Recommendation No. 4*

In the interim period, and pending the debate and consideration of the previous recommendation, and a decision on the future of the City of Toronto within the Metropolitan Corporation, the Committee recommends the appointment of a Housing Task Force, to be headed by a Chairman with outstanding qualifications and experience in the fields of housing and urban renewal. The Chairman would be an Executive Assistant of and directly responsible to the Mayor of the City of Toronto.

The Housing Task Force would consist of the Chairman, the newly appointed Director of Residential Building Inspection and Enforcement, and the Executive Director of the Housing Authority of Toronto. The Chairman should be conceived as a Housing Expediter, whose primary task would be to speak as the one major voice in the housing field for the City of Toronto, to co-ordinate the activities and the various housing responsibilities of existing City Departments, and to encourage the higher levels of government to proceed as expeditiously as possible with current, and projected housing and urban renewal schemes. The suggested length of appointment for the Chairman is a minimum of three years.

Recommendation No. 5

The Committee recommends that City Council create a Standing Committee on Housing.

The Standing Committee on Public Welfare, Fire, and Legislation has recently added Housing formally to its title. The Consultative Committee believes that the Housing Task Force and the Department of Housing will require a Standing Committee devoted solely to the consideration of the complex issues in the field of housing.

Recommendation No. 6

The Consultative Committee urges the City Council to strive for the improvement of Ontario legislation governing Maintenance and Occupancy By-laws to permit the City to encourage experimental community programmes designed to change code enforcement from a negative to a positive process in the central City. The possibility should be provided for community groups to undertake extraordinary programmes such as those now under way in Chicago, New York and Philadelphia. In cases of flagrant failure to comply with local by-laws an authorized community organization should be able to apply for an order that rents be paid into court pending compliance. This would be an alternative to repetitive action by the City.

Recommendation No. 7

City Council should continue its recently adopted policy of assigning newly acquired older houses, slated for eventual demolition in the

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

course of public works programmes, to the Housing Authority of Toronto for use as "housing for emergency purposes".

Recommendation No. 8

City Council should request that the Government of Ontario instruct the Ontario Housing Corporation to turn over the operation and management of Regent Park South in east-central Toronto to the Housing Authority of Toronto. The anomalous situation, which has existed for nearly nine years, of two public housing projects across the street from each other and operated under different rental scales (rents are higher in Regent Park South for the same family income) and different approaches to standards of maintenance, should be brought to an end. This would pave the way for a more efficient and integrated use of the existing public housing stock downtown.

Recommendation No. 9

Since residential land use is the most important single form of land use in the City, the Committee recommends that the City of Toronto Planning Board undertake a comprehensive study of the availability of land for housing purposes in central Toronto. In the absence of thorough research concerning a rational development of facilities for industry in certain areas, and for housing in other areas, the assumption that land is not available for public housing must be rejected.

Recommendation No. 10

Since it is now clear that the creation of the Ontario Housing Corporation (like all previous inter-governmental operations in the fields of housing and urban renewal in Canada) has not resulted in a formula to reduce substantially the time that must be devoted to the planning and inter-governmental agreements required to implement public housing and urban renewal schemes, the City must take the courageous but difficult step of initiating its own housing programme simultaneously with that of the Ontario Housing Corporation. There is no legislative barrier to the continued use of Sections 16 and 35C and 35D of the National Housing Act by a local municipality in Ontario. However, the municipality must be prepared to devote some of its own financial resources to the production of new housing accommodation.

The Consultative Committee has been told that in Alexandra Park and in Napier Place there will be no net addition to the total housing stock and, in fact, a number of persons and families will be permanently displaced from these neighbourhoods. If urban renewal programmes with a public housing component are to be of this nature, the continued construction of limited-dividend housing accommodation by the Housing Authority of Toronto is essential. Also, public housing accommodation for families, at rents geared-to-income, can be built by the City of

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

Toronto at a cost of 10% of the capital requirements and approximately \$600 per family per year in rental subsidies. In this manner the City would insure itself against the possible inadequacy of the Ontario Housing Corporation's efforts to provide the type of subsidized housing needed in the central municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

"Conclusion: As its final statement the Committee wishes to repeat the concluding paragraphs of its Interim Report:

"In recalling the efforts of the City of Toronto to initiate, construct and operate Regent Park North after 1947, the Committee is convinced that in a metropolis of nearly 1,750,000 persons there is sufficient concern, will, knowledge and understanding of urban planning and development, and that the metropolitan government, in co-operation with the City, can undertake the responsibility of providing, administering and operating programmes of public housing and urban renewal. It is assumed that the senior governments will set the standards and provide their appropriate share of financing, as stipulated in the National Housing Act and the Regulations thereto."

"After careful consideration and in the light of all the evidence, the Consultative Committee is convinced that local government should not abdicate its responsibilities in the fields of housing and urban renewal in the hope that the current housing emergency would thus be solved. Local government has a major role to play in the renewal of the central City and in the development of the Metropolitan Area of Toronto. With us, these are matters of principle and conviction."

Albert Rose, Chairman

Norah Johnson (Mrs.)

David B. Archer

Jacob Spelt

John E. Broome

John C. Spencer

Charles E. Hendry

Donald F. Bellamy, Secretary

LIST OF WITNESSES

Mr. W. Bond, Chief Housing Inspector, Department of Buildings, City of Toronto.

Mr. Robert B. Bradley, Executive Director, Housing Authority of Toronto.

Mr. Patrick E. Brady, Deputy Managing Director (Development), Ontario Housing Corporation.

Mr. John F. Brown, Urban Redevelopment Officer, Community Planning Branch, Department of Municipal Affairs, Ontario.

Mr. Peter Burns, Co-ordinator of Housing Standards By-laws, City of Ottawa.

Mr. Eli Comay, Commissioner of Planning, Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

Consultative Committee on Housing Policies for the City of Toronto.

Mr. Samuel J. Cullers, Study Director, Urban Renewal Study, Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

Mr. Leon Kumove, Consultant on Housing and Aging, Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Matthew B. M. Lawson, Commissioner of Planning, City of Toronto Planning Board.

Mr. David B. Mansur, Private Consultant.

Mr. Walter Manthorpe, Commissioner of Development, City of Toronto.

Mr. J. McCulloch, Toronto Branch Manager, Ontario Region, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Professor J. B. Milner, Professor of Law, University of Toronto.

Miss Robena Morris, Commissioner of Public Welfare, City of Toronto.

Dr. G. W. O. Moss, Deputy Medical Officer of Health, Department of Health, City of Toronto.

Mr. James A. Murray, Private Consultant, Professor of Architecture, University of Toronto.

Mr. Paul Ringer, Relocation Officer, Alexandra Park Urban Redevelopment Project.

Mr. Alex Sole, Housing Officer, Department of Public Welfare, City of Toronto.

Mr. H. W. Suters, Vice-Chairman and Managing Director, Ontario Housing Corporation.

Mr. W. A. Turnbull, Director of Welfare Services, Department of Public Welfare, City of Toronto.

Mr. F. E. Wellwood, Commissioner of Buildings, City of Toronto.

Members of City Council

Mayor Philip G. Givens, Q.C.

Controller William L. Archer

Controller Margaret Campbell

Alderman Horace Brown, Ward 4

Alderman Charles L. Caccia, Ward 3

Alderman June Marks, Ward 2

Alderman Paul Pickett, Ward 9

Alderman David Rotenberg, Ward 4

Alderman Mary Temple, Ward 7.